

ground, and a sense of unity. We represent all Americans, not just a few.

Looking back on the history, you will see it has been utilized as a standard Senate practice by Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike.

It is so important that in 2005, Senator SCHUMER, whom you just heard speak, said: “The ideologues in the Senate want to turn what the Founding Fathers called ‘the cooling saucer of Democracy’ into the rubber stamp of dictatorship.”

Yes, he said that doing away with the filibuster would effectively create a dictatorship.

More recently, in 2017, Senator SCHUMER doubled down on the need to keep the filibuster in a letter to Leader MCCONNELL. In his letter, Senator SCHUMER argued for the protection of “existing rules, practices and traditions as they pertain to the right of members to engage in extended debate on legislation before the United States Senate.”

To sum that up, he said no way should we cancel the filibuster.

That letter was signed by 33 Democrats, many of whom are still serving in this Senate as we speak. One of the signers who served at that time who signed this document is now the Vice President of the United States.

And it is not just the Vice President who has warned against ending the filibuster. In 2005, on this very floor, Senator Joe Biden warned that if the ability to filibuster were abolished, done away with, the Senate would become the House of Representatives.

I recognize that both sides of the aisle have, at some point, diminished the filibuster on nomination votes. In 2013, then-Senator Harry Reid lowered the vote threshold for Presidential appointments, other than Supreme Court nominees, to 51. In 2017, the Republicans turned around and lowered the standard to 51 for Supreme Court nominees.

Based on that, the left may call our opposition now hypocritical. But there is a big difference between legislation and nominations, including policy and our budget and nominees.

Debating legislation should include input from all Senators and be subject to compromise through the amendment process in order to be made better.

A nominee's qualifications are not subject to input or change. Voting on a nominee is a take-it-or-leave-it vote. You can't change their background or qualifications with more debate or more amendments. That is why they moved the vote to 50.

But the filibuster on legislation forces the majority to take into account the minority's position and to make the changes necessary to earn their support.

So now that the Democrats seem to be changing their tune on the legislative filibuster, it might be worth asking what has caused the Democrats to flip-flop and why now?

Well, there is one notable reason. Between 2017 and 2022, who is in control of the White House and Congress now?

Back in 2017, when the Democrats were in the minority, they understood the value of the minority's vote. But now they are in the majority, and all bets are off. They want to race through their party's Big Government socialist agenda with as little or no debate or opposition as possible. And Senate Democrats have embraced a radical, win-at-all-cost game plan for passing their progressive agenda, and they intend to and will break the Senate if they do it.

Democrats say their war on the filibuster has to do with strengthening voting rights, and they want to make it easier to vote and harder to cheat. If that were true, Democrats wouldn't have any problem passing this on a bipartisan level.

We all want to safeguard our elections so that all Americans have confidence in the integrity of our country's election process. But if access to the ballot box were an issue, it might come as a surprise that the 2020 election saw the largest voter turnout in over a century.

The Democrats are simply operating under a false idea. The States should run our election system, not the Federal Government.

What is more is, they will tell you they are embarking on this crusade to “save our democracy.” But the problem is, they want to do it by blowing up our democracy, blowing up this room.

Ending the filibuster means we would govern only by majority rule, stifling the voice of all minority and millions and millions of people who voted for the people who are in here in the minority.

Instead of saving it, this one-party rule would be the end of our democracy as we know it.

Instead of including the minority's voice in legislation that should serve all Americans, we would have radical swings back and forth every time the majority changed hands in this room.

Right now, there are few Democratic Senators who have stood up for the filibuster. They understand the important role of the minority's voice. This is not the House of Representatives. They understand the importance of making sure we listen to the voices of the millions of Americans who voted for the minority party, whoever it is. They know what even a small “exemption,” or what they call a “carve-out,” could lead to—devastation to this room.

So I ask the rest of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Why not join us and save the filibuster? That is what makes us the voice of all Americans. Why not focus on what you can do to lead in the face of many crises actually facing the American people?

In a recent poll, nearly 50 percent of Americans disapproved of President Biden's handling of COVID. The disapproval ratings were even higher when it came to the economy, taxes, crime, government spending, and immigration. It is clear that, right now,

Americans need more adults in this room and more leadership, and I can guarantee that the American people do not want leadership that resorts to changing the rules to get their way, to notch a win. The American people want leaders who actually address the problems they face, like COVID and inflation.

We cannot allow the failed leadership of Big Government socialists to be a scapegoat for eliminating the filibuster and fundamentally changing our country for the worse.

I yield the floor.

## RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:46 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. SINEMA).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

## NOMINATION OF ALAN DAVIDSON

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of our next vote, the nominee to head the National Telecommunications and Information Administration at the Department of Commerce, Alan Davidson.

My colleagues know now, in an information age, how important access to broadband is. They know because of COVID-19 how important it is for healthcare, how important it is for education, and how important it is for people to have the flexibility in all parts of the United States to have access to the ability to connect and to connect with people around the world.

We have long talked about the need for an NTIA Administrator who understands the public sector and understands the private sector. Mr. Davidson does that. He comes to us with a wealth of experience in both sectors, and he is coming at a time when my colleagues have been asking for more leadership from the administration on broadband issues. That is to say, many of my colleagues, like Senator WICKER, Senator KLOBUCHAR, and many others, have asked for coordination between various programs that exist within the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, and the issues in coordination with the FCC and oversight of their programs to better maximize the delivery of broadband.

The Presiding Officer knows how much money is now on the table for broadband. We all know that this implementation is going to take a very skilled hand at trying to address both the issues of affordability and access. But more importantly, we will be getting with Mr. Davidson somebody who understands these issues well and will help us strive to get America better connected as quickly as possible.